

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(Sacramento)

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JAMES WASHINGTON,

Defendant and Appellant.

C070722

(Super. Ct. No. 12F01092)

Appointed counsel for defendant James Washington asked this court to review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*).) Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we will affirm the judgment.

**I**

In February 2012 defendant and his codefendant, Latoya Tate, were found carrying 23 individually packaged plastic “Baggies” of methamphetamine with a total weight of over three grams. Defendant was arrested and charged with possessing

methamphetamine for sale in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11378. In the charging information, the People also alleged defendant had been previously convicted of robbery (Pen. Code, § 211), a strike offense.

Defendant pleaded no contest to the criminal charge but did not admit the prior strike. In accordance with his plea, the trial court sentenced defendant to the low term of 16 months in state prison. The court ordered defendant to pay various fines and fees, and awarded him 60 days of custody credit (30 days of actual and 30 days of conduct). Defendant appeals without a certificate of probable cause.

## II

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and asking this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed and we received no communication from defendant.

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

## DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
RAYE, P. J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
NICHOLSON, J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
BUTZ, J.